BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 09817 011 9

.2389
71

№ 2389.71

GIVEN BY

Hon. Francis G. Newlands

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Boston Public Library

https://archive.org/details/whitehouserestor00newl

THE WHITE HOUSE RESTORATION.

COMPENSATION OF ARCHITECTS.

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS,

OF NEVADA,

IN THE

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

February 29 and March 21, 1904.

2389.71

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

6789

WASHINGTON.
1904.

5951

Hon. Francis G. Newlands.
July 31st 1908.

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, having under consideration the bill (S. 1508) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building to be used for a Department of State, a Department of Justice, and a Department of Commerce and Labor—

Mr. NEWLANDS said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: I quite sympathize with any effort which tends to secure economy of expenditure in any Government improvement, provided the efficiency of that expenditure is not impaired.

Years ago I used to have the same views regarding architects which seem to be entertained by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE]; but after some years of experience in connection with building upon a large scale, matters in which I was personally interested, and matters in which corporations in which I was interested were engaged, I have come to the conclusion that there is no body of men in the United States more maligned than the architects of the United States—not intentionally, but simply because of unfamiliarity with the subject.

With reference to the compensation that is to be paid to these architects, I understand that such compensation is fixed by the rule of the Association of Architects. Their charge, I believe, is 1 per cent for preliminary drawings, 3½ per cent for plans without supervision, and 5 per cent for plans with supervision. That is the rule of all the architects of the United States, as I understand it. So, when you fix a less compensation in the bill, you necessarily exclude, it seems to me, from its operation these educated and trained men who belong to this association.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator mean to say that all the architects in the United States are in that trust?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I believe that every architect of good standing in the United States belongs to these architectural associations; that they are all in some measure allied to the National Institute of Architecture; and that the purpose of that organization is not spoliation or monopoly, but simply to advance art itself by securing able, competent, skilled, and trained men for this profession.

Mr. GALLINGER. To promote art itself, and at the same time increase their bank account. Is that the object?

Mr. NEWLANDS. As to bank accounts, I have never known an architect within my experience who has reached large fortune. I have always found that the great architects are much more interested in the perfection of their work than they are in the amount which they receive. I am sure that some of the greatest of our architects who have engaged in great works, involving very large expenditure of money, have paid out in the elaboration of their plans almost all they have received.

I had occasion the other day to go to New York——

Mr. HOAR. With the permission of the Senator, I wish to ask him if he thinks that the Association of Architects is any more of a trust, or any different from the law or the bar associations, or the medical associations?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I imagine not.

Mr. HOAR. Or other professional association?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Of course not.

Mr. HOAR. I do not suppose my friend from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] meant to say that architects in general were engaged in association for any unworthy purpose.

Mr. GALLINGER. No; I did not. But I think the Senator will permit me to say, as we hear a great deal in debate in these modern times about combinations and trusts, and a good deal of denunciatory talk, that I do not see any difference between a combination in a commercial or a manufacturing sense and a combination of architects to hold up to their terms the men who are constructing buildings. I use the word "trust" advisedly, for I think it is as much a trust as anything else that can be imagined. That is my judgment.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I do not care to be diverted from the present trend of my views by a discussion of the trust question. I assume that this association of architects resembles the bar associations, the associations of medical men, and other associations which are intended to advance the efficiency of certain professions. I am sure that any reasonable rule laid down by these professions regarding the nature and compensation of their services ought not to be regarded as assuming the aspect of a trust or a monopoly.

I was saying that if it be the fact that all of the eminent architects of the country belong to this association, and if we fix a compensation below that provided by their rules, we necessarily eliminate them from the competition and submit this whole matter to men who, as a rule, are inferior.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, supposing that the association next week should conclude that 10 per cent was the right thing, ought we to continue this system and pay that sum.

Mr. NEWLANDS. There is an unreasonable exaction and a reasonable charge.

Mr. GALLINGER. Unquestionably.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I propose in a moment to get to the question of the reasonableness of the charge.

Mr. GALLINGER. I hope the Senator will; for I am very much afraid that as to the next public building we construct we shall be called upon to pay 7½ or 10 per cent. There is no logic against it. All the association has got to do is to so resolve, and we are at their mercy.

Mr. NEWLANDS. The present rates have existed for years, and there has been no protest on the part of private builders.

So far as I am concerned, with a large experience in these matters, I have to say that every architect with whom I have had any connection has fully earned his money, whether the enterprise in which he was engaged was a small one or a large one. I assume, Mr. President, that the great corporations that are engaged in putting up large and expensive buildings, far surpassing in expense and in beauty most of our public buildings, and the great

men of wealth who are engaged in putting up large and expensive buildings in our great cities, would not be likely to submit to an exaction, and yet they all pay these rates.

We have an improvement contemplated in Washington, the construction of a great station building which has been provided for by Congress, a structure to be put up by the Pennsylvania Railroad and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad companies, at a cost exceeding $3,000,000, I believe. What do those corporations do? They go to one of the best architects in the country, Mr. Burnham, of Chicago—not, perhaps, so strong in his artistic sense as some of the other architects of the country, but uniting with artistic sense the highest business capacity, the qualities of an engineer, of a constructor, and of a financier.

We had an instance of the work of that great architect in the Chicago Exposition, which opened the eyes of the world to the possibilities of American architecture, advanced by the very architects belonging to this association, graduates of the art schools of this country, graduates of the art schools of Paris, men who had spent years and large amounts of money in their training. It is these men of whom the Senator from New Hampshire complains.

I will warrant that the railroad companies do not haggle with Mr. Burnham regarding his commission. I will warrant that they pay him the percentage provided for by the rules of the association to which he belongs.

So it was when Boston was about to construct its public library, one of the most beautiful buildings in the United States, constructed at a cost of only $1,000,000, I believe, but yet in the expenditure representing more in the way of art than any other building in the United States. That building was constructed by Mr. McKim, the architect of the White House, who is now the object of criticism. Did the city of Boston haggle with Mr. McKim then as to the compensation he received? I will warrant they paid him the 5 per cent provided for by the rules of this association.

Some time ago I was in New York, and I went into the office of Carrere & Hastings, noted architects of this country, standing upon an equality with the firm of McKim, Mead & White, of New York, the architects who laid out the great Buffalo exposition, which certainly was a thing of beauty. Carrere & Hastings had undertaken the construction of the great public library in New York, and I found them occupying two buildings with an army of men engaged in the work of designing that one building.

I imagine that the mere compensation which they receive counts nothing with those men as compared with the excellence of the work which they propose to do. I will warrant that they will spend every cent of their compensation, if it is necessary, in securing the best talent in the way of designers, in the way of constructors, in the way of engineers, and in the way of artists that may be necessary for the completion of that great work.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. NEWLANDS. So far as wealth is concerned—I beg the Senator's pardon; I yield to him.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator says that all the competent architects in the country are in this association; that outside of this association no good work can be secured. Now, if that be

so, the architect who made the plans for the addition to the St. Elizabeth's Asylum belongs to this association, and yet he has received 8 per cent on the amount appropriated by Congress—$48,000 or $44,000, I have forgotten which—on an expenditure of a little over $500,000.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will say that the charge of architects——

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Nevada——

Mr. NEWLANDS. If the Senator will permit me, I will say that under the rules of the association the charge of architects for alterations and improvements of an existing building is 10 per cent.

Mr. GALLINGER. But these were new buildings.

Mr. NEWLANDS. It is much harder to change a building already existing than to plan one anew.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator that these were new buildings of very common character—common brick buildings—and yet we have paid the architect for those buildings—and if the Senator will cross the river he will see them as he goes over—8 per cent, I think, and there is still a bill pending. We should limit in some way the compensation of these gentlemen, accomplished as they are. I quite agree with the Senator in his tribute to them. They believe in high art, and give us a little too much of it. That is the trouble with many of our buildings; they are too elegant for public use, in my judgment. But, if the Senator will go over to St. Elizabeth's Asylum he will see a very common set of brick buildings that these distinguished architects are responsible for, so far as the plans are concerned, and we paid out 8 per cent for them. Does the Senator want this bill left open so that when we have expended $500,000, these gentlemen will get $40,000 of that sum, and a like proportion on any additional sum expended? Does he not think we ought to limit it in some way?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will say to the Senator that I know nothing of the improvement to which he refers. I have not seen the building, and so I am unable to form a judgment. I certainly do not want to see inferior work, and I do not want to see extravagant compensation for it.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Under the bill the responsibility of contracting with the architects will rest upon three Cabinet officers—the Secretary of State, the Attorney-General, and the Secretary of Commerce and Labor; and I ask the Senator if we may not all repose confidence in that commission? Is there anyone here who has any suspicion whatever that those three Cabinet officers, constituting the commission of construction, will be derelict in performing their duty?

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, I will answer that by saying that I do not think they will pay any attention to it at all. That is my judgment.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I assume, Mr. President, that there must be some executive body to attend to this thing. I believe the matter of an agreement for the compensation for the architect's fees is an executive matter; and, whilst I recognize the right of Congress to limit the compensation which can be paid, I only oppose that kind of a limitation which, in my judgment, will prevent efficient service and prevent the securing of the proper talent for this work. I take it for granted that the gentlemen to whom the

Senator from Indiana [Mr. FAIRBANKS] has referred—able, as able as any of us are; economical, as economical as any of us are—will guard the interests of the Government in the discharge of their executive work just as well as we can; and I think they will be in a much better position to adjust this matter properly than we are, for they will have the means of judgment and they can secure the information that is necessary for them to arrive at a proper judgment.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] has referred to the architectural history of this city in aid of his contention that it is unnecessary to go to trained architects for work, and he has referred to the Treasury Department, to the Patent Office, and to the Post-Office, I believe, as specimens of good architecture.

Mr. GALLINGER. Not to the Post-Office.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Not the Post-Office?

Mr. GALLINGER. I hope not.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I mean the old Post-Office building, which is recognized as a very pure speciman of Grecian architecture.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Maine referred, at my suggestion, to the old Smithsonian building, which, in my judgment, is the finest specimen of architecture in Washington.

Mr. NEWLADS. I do not know the history of the Smithsonian building, but I feel sure that if you will inquire into the history of the construction of that building you will find that one of the best architects of the time was secured in its construction. Its very proportions indicate that a trained, experienced, and artistic architect accomplished that work.

So far as this Capitol is concerned, it was intrusted to the best architects of the time. Doctor Thornton, I believe, one of the great architects of this region, made the original design. His work was followed up by Mr. Walter, one of the great architects of the time, probably the greatest architect of the time. That work was not done under the supervision of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury.

I am not familiar with the history of the Treasury building or with the history of the old Post-Office building or the Patent Office, but I am sure that the best architects must have been connected with those great works.

In the early history of the Republic the architecture of this country was very much better than it has been in later years. Why? Because our architects were under the influence of the traditions of the European architects. They followed the European architecture. The colonial style of architecture, which is so much admired to-day, was simply a repetition of the continental architecture of that time, some of the colonial buildings being designed by great architects and some of them simply copied after existing plans, and almost all of them excellent. As to public architecture, you have only to read Jefferson's letters to see how solicitous he was that we should follow the best classic models.

But in the middle of the last century we fell upon a most unfortunate era, in which, disregarding all the traditions of this art and of this profession, trusting ourselves to carpenters and builders and stone masons, we erected all over this country the most amazing structures of hideousness. It has only been since the Chicago exposition that there has been a revival of architecture in this country. That revival was due to the enthusiastic and public-

spirited acts of the men belonging to this institute of architects which is so much criticised here to-day.

You will find that during the middle of the century and up until recent years almost all the buildings of Washington of a public character were inferior in their architectural effect. The Pension building—a monstrosity—the new Post-Office, designed in the office of the Supervising Architect, which we all admit is inferior, and the State, War, and Navy building, also designed in the office of the Supervising Architect, which, while perhaps not so bad, certainly will not compare with the Capitol or with the Patent Office or with the Treasury or the White House in artistic effect, though it involved a very large expenditure of money.

It does seem to me that we are fortunate to have so large, able, public spirited, and capable a body of men banded together in this association, not for the purpose of spoliating the public, not for the purpose of monopoly, but simply for the purpose of guarding the profession itself in the interest of art, and protecting the public itself from spoliation by men who otherwise would charge what they choose.

Recollect that the association limits the man of genius and talent as well as the inferior man, and that the compensation is the same, the only difference between them being that the man of recognized talent gets the great work. No man of talent can continue to secure such work unless he does the work well, unless he does good service.

These great corporations, like the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, like the Pennsylvania Railroad, like the great insurance corporations of New York, and these great banking companies, which are putting up these monumental structures throughout the United States—companies composed of men of business who measure every cent—certainly would not yield to this association of architects if they were a band of robbers simply gotten together for spoliation and robbery. It seems to me a word ought to be said in behalf of these men who are doing more in this country to make it beautiful and attractive than any other body of men in the country and who, in my judgment, are doing a higher public service to the country than any other association of men.

Now, criticism is passed upon the work in the White House. We limited the appropriation. They had to get along with $500,000, I believe, for the entire work, and the question was whether they should put on additions to that building which would entirely subordinate the old building and destroy its individuality in the beauty and the grandeur of the new, or whether they should maintain the simple individuality of that historic building; and we owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. McKim, if for nothing else, that he decided to hold to the individualized White House as it existed for a hundred years, not changing it or altering it at all, but completing it according to the original plans.

Mr. ALLISON. The law required him to do it.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Very well. The law probably required him to do it, but it was at the suggestion, I have no doubt, of Mr. McKim. Mr. McKim, I understand, was in communication with the White House.

Mr. BACON. I may be mistaken, but is not the contrary true, that Congress had reason to apprehend that there was going to be some undesirable changes, and Congress put this limitation on him to prevent him? Am I not correct, I will ask the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. ALLISON. I do not remember the circumstances. I remember very well that the law required him not to change the exterior appearance of that building or to add to it or take from it.

Mr. BACON. I will ask the Senator this: Was not that law passed after it was shown that the changes were about to be undertaken?

Mr. ALLISON. The law was passed because there was a consensus of opinion that no one should interfere with the appearance of that old building.

Mr. BACON. And Congress had reason to believe that there was about to be such interference?

Mr. ALLISON. There may have been people who had that fear; I do not know.

Mr. BACON. And there was foundation for that apprehension.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that in fact a plan had been made and exhibited in the White House showing the proposed changes.

Mr. BACON. It did change the exterior?

Mr. GALLINGER. Very materially.

Mr. BACON. Very materially changing the exterior, and at that time some of our leading Senators, as I recollect, who are very much to be thanked for the service performed, saw the necessity for such legislation and initiated it and carried it through. I think the thanks of the country are due to them for the protection of the White House against those changes.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia whether Mr. McKim was not in consultation with somebody regarding that building before the Senate took this action?

Mr. BACON. I think so, undoubtedly. That is exactly what I have allusion to. Of course I have no definite knowledge other than that which is generally shared by Senators and Representatives——

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will ask the Senator from Iowa whether it is not true that Mr. McKim was in consultation either with the President or some one in regard to that structure before the appropriation was made?

Mr. ALLISON. I have no doubt he was in such consultation. Of course there were many plans and suggestions as respects what should be done with that building, and Mr. McKim, among others, was consulted on the subject. The superintendent of public buildings and grounds at that time also had some decided views on the subject, but those views were all laid aside, if I may use that expression, by the committees having charge of the matter, and the request was made that an estimate be provided which would declare that the building should not be disturbed or the harmony of it or its general appearance changed, and that it should not be added to or taken from.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will ask the Senator from Iowa whether that conclusion was not in accordance with the views of Mr. McKim?

Mr. ALLISON. I do not know as to that. Mr. McKim did not appear before the Committee on Appropriations, which dealt with this subject, although they had his estimates before them. But there was sufficient reason, so far as concerns the committee and the Senate, to induce the committee to restrict these changes in such a way that the exterior of the building should not be disturbed.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I think the committee acted very wisely. All I contend is that I have always understood that Mr. McKim was brought into consultation regarding that building before the appropriation was made, and that the general views of the committee coincided with the views of Mr. McKim, or, if you wish to put it the other way, that the views of Mr. McKim coincided with the views of the committee.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. I can add a little something to the testimony of the Senator from Iowa with reference to this matter, not in any way contradicting it.

When the matter finally came up, as these things do, on the question of the money, the appropriation to pay the bills, a subcommittee waited upon the President. I will say to the Senator that instead of in any way assenting to his general proposition, that not only a distinctive suggestion, but I may say an adjuration was imposed upon the President that this man McKim should not be allowed in any way to interfere with the architectural beauty of the White House; and the only man from whom any danger was contemplated as likely to arise was this same architect.

I am free to say that I believe had not the committee jealously guarded that building and kept it in a way intact, preserved its fine, beautiful features, it would have been stripped, dismantled, ransacked, changed, and perverted and practically destroyed if we had let it go into the hands of the architect.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Do you base that upon any statement of Mr. McKim's?

Mr. HALE. Knowing what was generally in view, knowing that his scheme was to carry the Executive officer over to a new building on Jackson Square, we were very careful in every way to exclude the idea. We knew enough. I did not want any statement from Mr. McKim that he knew more about that building and what ought to be done than I did. No member of the committee wanted it. We did not go near him.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Let me suggest to the Senator from Maine, that if he had no statement from Mr. McKim it is hardly fair for him to state that he has no doubt that Mr. McKim would have dismantled that building and changed its whole structure.

Mr. HALE. I have no doubt whatever of it.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Very well. It is hardly fair, it seems to me, unless the Senator had some information from Mr. McKim to that effect, so to charge.

Mr. President, I am very glad to be corrected regarding the history of the White House construction. If the retention of that building in all its old simplicity is entirely due to the commiteee, great credit is due them. If any part of it is due to the President, credit is due him. If any part of it is due to Mr. McKim, credit is due him; but I do say that an appropriation of $500,000 was made, and with that appropriation it would have been possible for an architect to have departed very considerably from the present individualized appearance of the White House.

Mr. HALE. Not under the injunctions that we laid down, and we never should have appropriated unless we had had the assurance that none of those changes would be made.

Mr. NEWLANDS. It would have been very easy, had an inferior architect been selected, to have put up the executive building right adjoining the White House, and in such a way as to interfere with its architectural completeness, and yet the architect would have done it under the appropriation. No particular place was designated where a particular structure of improvement was to be made. You gave general instructions, it is true——

Mr. GALLINGER. Does not the Senator think it would have looked better if it had been put in the rear of the White House instead of where it is?

Mr. NEWLANDS. So far as that building is concerned, I was going to say that all lines pointed out by the original architect of the White House were pursued. The original plans were looked up. Those original plans provided for the arcade upon each side which has been the subject of criticism. They were in the original plans of the White House, and in providing for them Mr. McKim only carried out the original design.

It was essential that there should be executive offices. The White House was crowded and was almost deprived of its character as a home by reason of the executive offices. They had to be placed somewhere, and where it would be convenient. Now, architecturally, that structure, I say, was located at the right place. I do not say that simply from my own judgment, but the judgment of the best architects of the country—I state that the architects of the country have come to the protection of Mr. McKim against the assaults which have been made upon him.

He is the president of the Institute of Architects of this country. Do you suppose that that great body of men would select an inferior man as their chief official? He is the man who designed the public library in Boston, where they have greater taste for art than in any other city in the United States, and he has done the very best work in the country. He is so generally recognized, not only in this country but throughout the world, that he received some decoration at the hands of the King of England only a short time ago. This decoration was regarded as a proper tribute to the character and the artistic quality of the man by architects all over the world.

Now, then, as you view the White House from Jackson Square, so far as proportion is concerned, there is nothing to find fault with.

Mr. BACON. I should like to inquire of the Senator whether that decoration was conferred before or after the construction of the Executive office? Was a photograph of it submitted to His Majesty before the decoration was conferred?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I do not know about that.

Now, so far as the material is concerned, it is the only thing you can question about the Executive Office. If he had put a high structure there, it would have subordinated the White House. It had to be a low structure, almost unobservable. So far as the color is concerned, it is just as is the White House. So far as proportions are concerned, it is perfect in its proportions.

Now, you can criticise the material because it is made of brick, painted white. I have no doubt the architect would have used marble if you had given him the money to do it, but he was limited by the appropriation, and he had to put it up. It is regarded simply as a temporary structure, costing, I think, only fifteen or twenty thousand dollars.

Mr. BACON. Sixty thousand dollars.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Perhaps $60,000; I do not know.

Mr. BACON. The Senator's suggestion as to the cost, I suppose, is controlled largely by the view, from looking at the building, he would take as to what would be the proper cost. But that is only one-fourth the cost.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should think myself——

Mr. FORAKER. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. FORAKER. I understood him to say just now that tha structure cost not to exceed fifteen or twenty thousand dollars.

Mr. NEWLANDS. That was my impression.

Mr. FORAKER. I hope that is true. I have heard it stated, however, and repeatedly, that it cost $65,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is correct.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Well, it may be so.

Mr. FORAKER. Senators sitting about me say that it is correct.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Then, it seems to me, it cost too much.

Mr. FORAKER. Yes; that is the popular impression.

Mr. NEWLANDS. But so far as the design itself is concerned, its proportions, its relation to the White House itself, I insist upon it that it could not have been more perfect, and that the only thing to be complained of, regardless of the question of cost, is as to the material of which it is composed. Doubtless many would have been better pleased had a striking structure been placed there, but its very merit is its simplicity and unobtrusiveness.

Senators have spoken of a plan that was on exhibition there, the plan that was gotten up by the army engineer in charge of public buildings. That elaborate design, involving an extensive wing upon each side, as did the design that was presented to Congress at one time by the wife of President Harrison, involved a very large expenditure of money and involved almost a destruction of the individuality of the White House itself.

Now, here is a sample of a design cheaply secured. The army engineer in charge of the public buildings had in his employ at that time a designer, not an independent architect, not a man who could go out in the world and wrestle with others and secure work, but a man who, having had an architectural training, lacked the peculiar qualities which would have given him success in his profession, and therefore could be secured for a very small salary: and he made that great design which would have cost a very large sum. Suppose you had accepted it. You would have saved in the architects' fees and you would have lost in the great expenditure for the building. That is what I say is the advantage to be secured by getting these men of training and experience. You not only get art, you not only get efficiency, you not only get perfect construction, but you also get the most economical construction.

Senators have referred to the Supervising Architect's Office. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] referred to it as if that Office were almost conducted without cost, and he hopes the time will come when the construction of these buildings will be turned into the Supervising Architect's Office. The present Supervising Architect is one of the very best men who has ever occupied that position, but I assume he would not accept a posi-

tion yielding only $5,000 a year if he could contend in the world with such men as Carveré & Hastings or McKim, Meade & White. I suppose he will not assume that he stands in the same grade with them. He runs this Office, and he has an expenditure in this Office——

Mr. GALLINGER. I interrupt the Senator to say, if that be so, why should not the Government get in that Office this high talent for which the Senator is contending?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Very well. Pay a man $50,000 and you will get it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Why should we keep an inferior man there who is really in charge of our public buildings?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Pay a man $50,000 and you will get him.

As to the cost of that office, I do not know what the annual expenditure for public buildings is. I have had no opportunity to prepare myself on this subject. I came into this Chamber only a few moments ago and found this matter under discussion. It is a new question to me, but I imagine that the total expenditures of this country for public buildings does not exceed $5,000,000. Am I right, may I ask the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. ALLISON. The appropriation for the Supervising Architect's Office is a very small sum relatively; but the custom of the Supervising Architect's Office is to retain 5 per cent of every appropriation for supervision, plans, etc., and therefore I should say that the annual expenditure would be more than 5 per cent upon the amount expended annually.

Mr. NEWLANDS. So it seems that now the Government is paying 5 per cent for the work that is done in the Supervising Architect's Office. From every appropriation that is made for a public building, costing, say, a million dollars, $50,000, 5 per cent, is set aside by the Supervising Architect for the expenses of the plans and supervision. How can you object to 5 per cent being paid to men of talent outside?

Mr. HALE. That is done for emergencies, general supervision, janitors, and this fee that the architect gets is besides that. It is in addition to it. That is the whole point of the matter. There is not a dollar of this sum saved by employing an architect. It is a wise thing in a large building to reserve something for emergencies, things that come up which are unanticipated, and that is always done. But the architect's fee is aside and independent of that entirely, and it does not cut off a cent from the building—not one cent—if you employ an architect.

Mr. NEWLANDS. As I understand, the architect's fees cover not only the plans, but the supervision.

Mr. HALE. Only what they call the "architectural" work.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes; construction.

Mr. HALE. After a building is started the architect does not go near it more than once in several weeks.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Well, he would——

Mr. HALE. Well, he does not. But we do have a superintendent of buildings, and if it is a large building he has his subordinates, he has janitors, he has everybody else, and the 5 per cent is reserved to cover all that. But the architect has nothing to do with that.

As I said, he does not appear, he does not show himself near the building after he has put his plan in and got his fees started; at least not often.

Mr. NEWLANDS. The Senator from Maine has had an entirely different experience among architects than I have.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, in the Tarsney Act it is specifically provided that the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department shall superintend these buildings.

Mr. DRYDEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. DRYDEN. I should like to state what my information is as to the practice of architects in superintending the construction of a structure.

He enters into a contract with his employer that he will not only prepare the plans and designs and prepare the specifications, but that he will superintend the work. Now, it is true that a great architect does not personally go every day and walk over the beams and climb onto the different stories to look at the work, but he keeps his superintendents there to do it, men who are in his employment, men who are paid by him, and they do the work and they are skilled men in their work. If a contract is made with one of these big architects, those men take the place of the very force which it has been stated here the Government keeps in its architectural office.

Mr. HALE. That is not experience, nor is it my experience in the erection of private structures. I have had to build, from the desires and the necessities and the ravages of fire within the last fifteen years, three pretty good sized houses. I paid the architect for the plans, and just paid him his percentage, a big price, but I had a contractor to manage the whole thing and I had to pay him. The architect never in any way reduced by one dollar the expenses that I was at with reference to the supervision of the structure. It was all extra. And I say that the architect who furnishes plans for Government buildings is all additional. It does not take the place of anything. Five per cent is reserved by the Government, as it always was before.

Mr. DRYDEN. My experience has been directly contrary to that of the Senator from Maine. I know it is customary when large structures are to be erected to stipulate such a condition in the contract with the architect, that he shall furnish these men to examine the work as it goes on and certify to its correctness, and if the work is found to be improper it is rejected, and rejected on the certificate of these men whom the architect keeps there to act for him. If the Government was to enter into a contract with any of these big architects who construct these enormous buildings, it can make such a condition in the contract, and the architect will agree to it.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I wish to say what the Senator from New Jersey would be too modest to say, that there is nowhere, neither in the Senate nor anywhere else, a person more capable of speaking upon this subject than the honorable Senator from New Jersey. One of the most splendid office buildings in the United States—yes, one of the finest in the world—has been constructed by him, and while I have no certain knowledge upon the subject, I

am very well satisfied to follow the better opinion of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Will the Senator from Maine permit me to inquire whether or not he paid the architect to whom he referred 5 per cent commission?

Mr. HALE. Two and a half per cent.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Then you paid two and a half per cent simply for the plans which did not involve supervision?

Mr. HALE. I was younger then than I am now, and greener. I paid him what he asked.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Two and a half per cent for all these structures that you referred to? You spoke of having put up three.

Mr. HALE. I paid all expenses, all incidental expenses. I found no fault with him. He was a very competent, bright architect, one of the very best, but he did not manage the construction of the building.

Mr. NEWLANDS. What is that?

Mr. HALE. He did not manage the construction of the building. He turned over his plans to the builder. The builder employed his joiners, his carpenters, his day laborers, and built the building, and when he had a bill to present he presented it to me and I paid it. But the architect did not manage it, and there is no necessity in these cases, with this bureau that we have there, for the architect charging for the management of the building.

Mr. NEWLANDS. It is very clear to me that the Senator must have made an arrangement such as is often made covering simply the plans and involving no supervision whatever as to details and no responsibility whatever as to construction.

Now, the architect's duties are defined in the annual report of the Supervising Architect, in which he speaks of the Tarsney Act:

> The law that authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to adopt this method of procuring designs, known as the "Tarsney Act," provides that in carrying it into effect the successful architect is to have local supervision of the construction, the function of the office of the Supervising Architect being of an advisory or a supervisory nature.

So that the architect is to have the local supervision of the construction. He is to have supervision of the contract, and if the contractor puts in inferior material he orders it to be taken out; and my experience is that a very valuable part of the architect's work is that which comes under this head.

Mr. GALLINGER. Now, Mr. President, at that point——

Mr. NEWLANDS. Let me keep the floor just one moment longer and I will yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. I wish to call the Senator's attention to something on that very point. He has the report of the Supervising Architect on that point, from which he reads?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Supervising Architect had turned to the statute enacted in 1893 he would have found this provision, which relates directly to his office:

> That the general supervision of the work shall continue in the office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department, the Supervising Architect to be the representative of the Government in all matters connected with the erection and completion of such buildings, the receipt of proposals, the award of the contract therefor, and the disbursements of moneys thereunder, and perform all the duties that now pertain to his office, except the preparation of drawings and specifications for such buildings.

It seems to me that so far as the supervision is concerned, under this statute, which provides for competition between outside

architects, the Supervising Architect is specifically charged with the supervision of the construction.

Mr. NEWLANDS. The Supervising Architect does not say so in his report.

Mr. GALLINGER. Well, he forgot to quote the language.

Mr. NEWLANDS. He says "the architect is to have local supervision of the construction, the function of the office of the Supervising Architect being of an advisory or supervisory nature." It is true that the Supervising Architect represents the Government just as my agent would act for me if I were putting up a building. I would have a certain degree of control over the architect, but that would not involve my assumption of his duty in the supervision of the construction itself.

Now, Mr. President, I was just getting to one point. I sent to the room of the Committee on Appropriations a few moments ago to inquire what amount was allowed the Supervising Architect's Office for the supervision of the construction of the various public buildings of this country. I find that while the specific allowance to that Office is only $5,220, yet there is authorized to be paid from public-building appropriations $300,000, making a total of $305,000, which is 5 per cent on——

Mr. ALLISON. Six million dollars.

Mr. NEWLANDS. It is 5 per cent on $6,000,000, and I assume that the annual expenditures of the Government for public buildings in this country does not exceed that amount. So it seems that even when we assign this work of making plans to the Supervising Architect, the plans and supervision of the Government buildings involve an expenditure of 5 per cent.

It is true that you can pay an architect, if you choose, simply for his plans, and you can get them for a less sum than 5 per cent; but it seems to me that no greater mistake could be conceived than to get a great design for a great building from a great architect, and then when the time for construction comes absolutely absolve him from all responsibility regarding it. I should call that in the highest degree unbusinesslike, involving possibly great defects in construction, great defects in design, and great defects in the artistic perfection of the building.

March 21, 1904.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is pending, as in Committee of the Whole, to the amendment of the committee an amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. It will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 6, line 8, after the word "architects," strike out "to" and insert:

The successful architect shall receive compensation in full for plans, specifications, and detail drawings not to exceed 2½ per cent of the total cost of said building, and shall also.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words regarding the amendment to the amendment. I have sought information as to the cost of the plans and supervision of public

buildings when undertaken by the Supervising Architect's Office as compared with the cost when under the supervision of a private architect. I made inquiry of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury. I ask leave to put his communication upon this subject in the RECORD:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 11, 1904.

Hon. FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS,
United States Senate.

SIR: Referring to office letter of the 10th instant, in reply to yours of the same date, I have the honor to state that in the endeavor to make a prompt reply a table made in 1902 was used without noticing that it was not an exact answer to your question (item No. 3), although it is correct, taken in connection with the text of the letter of which it forms a part, copy of which was inclosed to you in office letter of March 10.

I now submit as a proper reply to item No. 3 the following table, with request that it be considered a substitute for that inserted on the first page of my letter above referred to:

Year.	Expended on construction.	Expended, Supervising Architect's Office.	Per cent.
1899	$2,520,367	$120,974	0.048
1900	3,214,545	136,045	.042
1901	5,444,408	152,363	.032
1902	3,924,618	161,369	.042
1903	4,765,763	184,506	.039

Under the heading "Expended on construction" is included the cost of construction of buildings exclusive of sites.

Under the heading "Supervising Architect's Office" is included the compensation of persons employed in making drawings, specifications, etc., being 70 per cent of the total pay roll, and includes cost of all such work as would be done by a private architect.

Respectfully, J. K. TAYLOR, *Supervising Architect.*

The Supervising Architect of the Treasury tells me that the cost of making drawings, specifications, etc., in his office has ranged during the past five years from about three and a half to over four and a half per cent of the total cost of construction. That has been the case during the past five years, and this cost covers what would otherwise be included in and covered by the fee of 5 per cent allowed to private architects. I do not understand what the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] remarked the other day, that the payment to a private architect of 5 per cent on Government work is in addition to the expenditures incurred in the Supervising Architect's Office. On the contrary, the 5 per cent paid to a private architect includes and covers the expenses that would otherwise be incurred by the Supervising Architect, with the exception simply of the supervision on the Government's behalf by the Supervising Architect or some subordinate employed by him.

I am told also that with reference to the Government Printing Office the expenditures there on account of plans, draftsmen supervision, etc., amount to over 5 per cent. I shall ask to insert in the RECORD a letter from——

Mr. TELLER. Let it be read.

Mr. NEWLANDS. The Senator from Colorado asks to have the letter read, and I will send it to the desk.

Mr. HALE. I wish the Senator would state whom the letter is from.

Mr. NEWLANDS. It is from the president and secretary of the American Institute of Architects.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The letter will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY, THE OCTAGON,
Washington, D. C., March 10, 1904.

Hon. FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Complying with your request, I beg to advise you that we have information from various architectual societies of the world on file at the Octagon, the offices of the American Institute of Architects. We have special information on government structures, and this data shows the following fees are charged by architects: England, 5 per cent on the cost; France, 5 per cent on the cost; Germany, 5 to 10 per cent on the cost; Italy, 8 per cent on the cost; Russia, 8 per cent cn the cost; Switzerland, 5 to 8 per cent on the cost.

We were told by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] and by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] that the law itself compelled the restoration of the White House according to the original plan, and that the credit was due to the law and not to the architects. I have to say, with reference to that, that the law is contained in an appropriation bill. I have looked over that bill, and I find no directions whatever as to the methods to be pursued regarding the plan. There is an appropriation of a considerable sum, to be expended under the direction of the President.

Mr. TELLER rose.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Does the Senator from Colorado wish to nterrupt me?

Mr. TELLER. I should like to have the Senator tell us, before he gets through, what particular part, save the exterior of the White House, those architects have preserved? They have added to it what I think is a monstrosity; they have destroyed the original building, and inside they have entirely changed it, so far as I have been able to observe.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will state in the first place——

Mr. TELLER. They have possibly left one room, what we call the East Room; but they have overhauled that to such an extent that I think it has destroyed its beauty, at least.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I think that others will differ from the Senator from Colorado in that view. I assume that it was conceded in the last debate that, so far as the White House is concerned, everything was most creditable and that the only criticism was directed toward the Executive office.

Mr. TELLER. I am not willing to concede that myself. I think it is most absurd. I may not be so good a judge as is the gentleman to whom the Senator refers; but I have yet to find anybody who has been inside of the White House with whom I have discussed the question, unless it may be the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], who has not entertained the same opinion that I have.

Mr. NEWLANDS. That has not been my experience.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to take that question up at some time.

Mr. NEWLANDS. This question of taste or of judgment is one that can hardly be settled upon the floor of the Senate. I imagine the best way would be to obtain the opinion of competent experts on that subject if there is any doubt in the mind of the Senate.

Mr. HALE. The easiest way, undoubtedly, would be to leave it all to the architects.

Mr. NEWLANDS. That is the easiest way.

Mr. HALE. Undoubtedly.

Mr. NEWLANDS. And the best way.

Mr. HALE. No doubt the Senator believes that the easiest and best way would be to leave it all to the architects.

Mr. NEWLANDS. The best way would be to leave it to the architects and artists of the country, and I have no doubt we should then have a very much better judgment than can be exercised by the men of this body, untrained as we are in this great art.

Mr. TELLER. If I may be allowed to enter into the Senator's speech, I should like to say that if that work represents the judgment of the architects, and what the Senator calls "the best taste of the country," I am greatly mistaken.

Mr. NEWLANDS. As I said before, that is something which we can not settle by debate upon this floor.

I merely wish to call attention to certain inaccuracies of statement in the last debate. It was insisted upon that the law itself compelled the restoration of the White House according to the original plan. I have examined that law, and there is nothing to that effect. So the Senator from Iowa was mistaken when he insisted on that.

The Senator from Maine also insisted upon it that if it had not been for the action of the committee of conference the White House would have been practically despoiled. Let me quote his words upon this subject. He says:

> The subcommittee waited upon the President. * * * I may say an adjuration was imposed upon the President that this man McKim should not be allowed in any way to interfere with the architectural beauty of the White House, and the only man from whom any danger was contemplated as likely to arise was this same architect.

Then he goes on to say that had not the committee jealously guarded the building—

> it would have been stripped, dismantled, ransacked, changed and perverted, and practically destroyed if we had let it go into the hands of the architect.

So I assume from this that the Senator from Maine, at all events, did not think that as a matter of fact the White House had been stripped, dismantled, ransacked, changed, and perverted, but that all this had been averted by the action of the committee of conference; that the work on the White House was good work and was the result of the action of the committee of conference, and not of the action of this architect. Regarding that, I have to say that the RECORD shows that from the start the idea, and the only idea, of Mr. McKim was to restore the White House according to the designs and the general plans of the original architect, and to expurgate all the heresies in architecture that meanwhile had been produced there.

We find in the report of the architects regarding the White House that they first quote the act authorizing them to go on with the restoration, and then they state their purpose, which was:

> First. To make the White House structurally sound.
>
> Second. To relieve the White House of the executive offices, which had so encroached upon the space as to diminish the residence portions of the house to an unreasonable and abnormal extent.
>
> Third. To make a rearrangement of the White House space so as to permit the comfortable and dignified entertainment of such number of guests as a house of that size might reasonably be called upon to accommodate.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> The first aim, therefore, was to discover the design and intention of the original builders, and to adhere strictly thereto, in so far as the public or

state portions of the house were concerned; and then to make the apartments reserved for private or family uses comfortable, according to modern requirements and standards.

I am told that most dilligent search was made for the original plans and drawings regarding this building, and those original plans and drawings developed the fact that upon each side of the White House was the arcade which has now been restored, and part of the remnants or ruins of the east arcade were found in the glass conservatory, which was destroyed under their direction.

Now, with reference to the offices they say in their report:

To construct within those grounds a building sufficiently large and imposing to stand as permanent offices would be to detract from the White House itself so seriously as to be absolutely out of the question. The one possible solution, therefore, was to occupy the only available space with a temporary building which should be comfortable within and inconspicuous in appearance, leaving Congress at its leisure to take up seriously the question of a permanent, adequate, and thoroughly dignified office for the Chief Executive.

They then quote their original estimate made to Congress, the very estimate upon which the Appropriations Committee acted in the law which has been referred to by the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Iowa; and that estimate clearly calls for—I will quote it:

Provision for temporary quarters for the Executive offices is comparatively a simple matter. A building of brick, one story high, and containing from 50 to 75 per cent more room than the offices now occupy, can be constructed in the grounds of the White House opposite the entrance to the Navy Department. The building would take the place now occupied by a brick wall which screens a number of hothouses and forcing beds for plants, functions which may well be provided for elsewhere, in connection with the propagating gardens.

It then goes on to state what the temporary building would include, and makes an estimate for the cost of this temporary building, exclusive of furniture, of $33,000.

I have had this building cubed, and I find that it is a little over 100 feet long, 50 feet wide, and over 30 feet high, and that it contains between 180,000 and 200,000 cubic feet. There is not a man who is familiar with building who does not know that ordinary suburban building of frame costs from 22 cents to 25 cents a cubic foot. This building cost not to exceed 25 cents a cubic foot. It was intended to be a temporary building, and was and is a temporary building.

It is true that the Committee on Appropriations, when it came to consider this measure, added $10,000 to the estimate, but it is simply, as stated in the law, for the purpose of making the walls more durable. I quote from the appropriation act:

And said building shall be constructed with sufficient foundation and walls suitable for a durable, permanent building, and of sufficient strength for an additional story when needed.

If the Committee on Appropriations desired a permanent building to be constructed there, it was incumbent upon them to make a sufficient appropriation, and the appropriation should have been at least 75 cents or a dollar a cubic foot for such work as goes into these great ornamental, monumental buildings. As it was, they added only $10,000, and they simply stipulated that the walls should be sufficient for a permanent, durable building. They did not say that the building itself should be permanent; on the contrary, they contemplated changes in the form of the construction itself when they suggested that an additional story should be added.

The work of these architects came within the appropriation. The cost of this building was about $45,000, an average of about 25 cents per cubic foot, about the cheapest kind of construction that is known. It was impossible for them, within the limits of the appropriation, to make any better showing than has been made and at the same time to give the space that is absolutely essential for the executive offices.

Right there in that suggestion of the law comes the difference between the legislative mind and the artistic mind as to what the character of the building adjoining the White House should be. These architects in their report refer to this stipulation in the appropriation bill that the walls should be of such weight and permanence as to support an additional story, and say that they hope that an additional story will never be put upon this building, for that, of course, would be to subordinate, to that extent, the White House, and the controlling principle of its construction was to make it as inconspicuous as possible.

If the Congress does wish Executive offices of sufficient durability and dignity to be constructed, it is easy enough to do it by appropriating sufficient money. If Congress concludes that the present location is the best for those offices, it will be easy enough to construct to the south of this building an additional building of marble or white stone, a permanent building, put the President's offices there, and then tear down the existing building, or keep the latter for the clerical force, facing it with marble or white stone, using the same material as in the new building, and connecting it with the new building by a passageway such as connects the Senate wing with the main or central building of the Capitol. This would be much better, according to the view of architects, than to put a second story on the existing building. But such a work would probably cost $150,000 or $200,000 if you wish to make it compare in material, durability, and decoration with the monumental work of public buildings in this city.

So it seems that it was clearly contemplated at the very start by these architects that they should pursue the original plans; that they should carry them out; that they should simply take away what is false in art that had been introduced during the intermediate time by supervising architects and builders and contractors, for all of them had a shy at this.

Since the classic simplicity of our early public architecture, the architecture of Washington's and Jefferson's time, we have had the Pullman-car era in architecture, we have had the steamboat era in architecture, and we have had the Hoffman House era in architecture—these very brilliant displays of glass and light and everything of that kind. But I am glad to say there has been a renaissance in art since that intermediate time; and this building, I firmly believe, has been built according to the best rules of this reformed art, which has simply meant the return to the simplicity and dignity of earlier days. At all events, it was clearly contemplated that the architects should stand by the original plans as to the White House itself, and that these Executive offices should be quickly and inexpensively constructed to meet the pressing requirements of the President.

The President was eager to get into these offices, so that the public business could be transacted without inconvenience; he wanted to have a home, and the whole country wanted him to have a home, not to be invaded for purposes of business. So it

was necessary to construct them in the short space of four and a half months; to have taken longer would have been to the injury of the public business. I insist upon it that these architects did the very best thing that could be done under the circumstances.

It is easy enough for Congress, if it wants a permanent and durable and monumental building there, to construct it. I trust, however, that Congress will carry out the views of these architects and make this building as inconspicuous and as unobtrusive as possible.

I have no doubt that it would gratify some to see a Chinese pagoda there, to see a big dome, to see minarets and towers, to see the roof colored sky blue and the cornice red—anything that is brilliant and conspicuous—but I submit that people of good taste will be better satisfied if this building is so inconspicuous and so unobtrusive that its existence will hardly be observed; and that will be the highest triumph of art.

I will read a little further from the report of the architects on this matter:

> The preliminary survey contemplated merely putting the house in order and making it safe. There was no consideration given at that time to more ample provision for large dinners and for accommodations for the large public receptions. A study of the historic White House, however, and the discovery in the Library of Congress of old prints and plans of the house show that by a return to the original design the White House can be put into such a condition that it will serve every use intended for many years to come, and that the increased demands for room in the house can be met in a dignified and satisfactory manner at a cost which is small when compared with the cost either of a new residence or of additions to the present building, both of which projects are objectionable from many points of view.

They go on to say:

> The principles on which the restoration would be done are these:
>
> To put the house in the condition originally planned, but never fully carried out.
>
> To make the changes in such manner that the house will never again have to be altered—that is to say, the work should represent the period to which the house belongs architecturally, and therefore be independent of changing fashion.

It is very natural for the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Iowa to fall into error regarding this plan and to charge Mr. McKim with responsibility for plans that had been made prior to his employment, but I think the confusion in their minds arises from this: It is true that during Mr. Harrison's Administration Mrs. Harrison had a plan for the enlargement of the White House—a very handsome plan and a very ambitious plan—which involved the addition of wings fully as large, I believe, as the White House itself.

Mr. TELLER. I think the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Well, nearly as large. That is my recollection, for I saw the design.

The design was a good one, but it was not the old White House; it was a new creation. The old White House was almost lost in the new structure. That plan was under consideration for some time.

Then, later on, Colonel Bingham took up the work when he became superintendent of public buildings and grounds, and, with the aid of a draftsman and designer in his office, he presented a plan even more ambitious, with wings adjoining and magnificent domes upon each side. In those plans the White House was subordinated to the new structure. They were presented to the consideration of the American Institute of Architects, which hap

pened to be in session at Washington, at the White House, upon the invitation of President McKinley. The plans met the disapproval of the American Institute of Architects, who passed resolutions in which they expressed their wish that the old simplicity and dignity of the White House should be maintained, and that no structure should be put there which would subordinate it, which would make it the inferior structure. They declared against all these plans.

So it seems that prior to the propaganda of which the Senator from Maine speaks—the propaganda conducted by the conference committee, I believe, of the Committee on Appropriations—and before they had adjured the President not to permit any deviation from the original plans, this movement was at work, and it was a movement that was inaugurated by the American Institute of Architects, which has been under such criticism here. Later on the President called into consultation Mr. McKim, and Mr. McKim presented the plans which have been carried out.

Mr. McKim never contemplated the erection of a structure there that would destroy the old White House or subordinate it. He never for a moment contemplated anything but the restoration of the old dignity and simplicity of the White House. He never contemplated putting up any structure there which would be a monument to his genius or talent, but simply in the short space of four months and a half such an additional structure as was absolutely necessary to meet the wants of the President and which would be as unobtrusive and inconspicuous as possible.

So I claim that my remark in the preceding debate, to the effect that we owe these architects a debt of gratitude for the practical restoration of the old White House and the carrying out of the original plans and designs, is borne out by the record in this case, and that the structure as it exists to-day was not either compelled by the law or controlled by the committee of conference. Their remarks to the President were simply confirmatory of the plans he had had in his own mind as the result of his conference with Mr. McKim and Mr. McKim's advice.

Mr. President, I have taken up quite a long time with the consideration of this matter, which is really extraneous to the pending bill, and I beg pardon of the Senator from Indiana for detaining the Senate so long. But it does seem to me that when great artists do a great work for the public in an unaffected and self-effacing way, their action should not be the subject of mistaken representation here, and that they should receive here the vindication they deserve.

I ask leave to insert as an appendix to my remarks an extract from the report of the architects concerning the work of repairing and refurnishing the White House and the erection of the Executive office building.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection, and it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Extracts from architects' report in Senate Document No. 197, Fifty-seventh Congress, second session, entitled "Restoration of the White House." Message of the President transmitting the report of the architects, McKim, Mead & White.]

These problems may be stated briefly as follows:

First. To make the White House structurally sound.

Second. To relieve the White House of the Executive offices, which had so encroached upon the space as to diminish the residence portions of the house to an unreasonable and abnormal extent.

Third. To make a rearrangement of the White House space so as to permit the comfortable and dignified entertainment of such number of guests as a house of that size might reasonably be called upon to accommodate. This was perhaps the most imperative as well as the most perplexing problem. The perils to health, and even to life itself, of the exposure of large numbers of people on the unsheltered north portico during occasions of public receptions, the use of a window exit, the enforced giving up of a considerable portion of the main floor to dressing rooms—all these things had combined to bring about a strong demand for some change for the better.

Fourth. To provide the White House with a state dining room of dimensions sufficient to enable the President to entertain at table on occasion about 100 guests.

Fifth. To remove such excrescences as had been allowed to accumulate about the White House to the detriment of its fine architectural features and its dignity as the home of the President of the United States.

Recognizing the feeling prevalent among the people, you stipulated that none of the essential features of the White House should be sacrificed in the restoration; that the nation's historic house should be left intact, and that even the state rooms should continue to be known by the names made familiar by long usage. These limitations—if limitations they can be called—were welcomed, because among no class of the people was the feeling for the historic White House stronger than among the members of the profession of architecture. The first aim, therefore, was to discover the design and intention of the original builders, and to adhere strictly thereto in so far as the public or state portions of the house were concerned; and then to make the apartments reserved for private or family uses comfortable, according to modern requirements and standards.

TEMPORARY EXECUTIVE OFFICES.

Obviously the first step was to find some place other than the White House for the Executive offices. Every suggestion for the location of a permanent office building was open to some objection that seemed insuperable. No location outside the White House grounds could be decided upon and secured in the short time available. To construct within those grounds a building sufficiently large and imposing to stand as permanent offices would be to detract from the White House itself so seriously as to be absolutely out of the question. The one possible solution, therefore, was to occupy the only available space with a temporary building, which should be comfortable within and inconspicuous in appearance, leaving Congres at its leisure to take up seriously the question of a permanent, adequate, and thoroughly dignified office for the Chief Executive.

The statement made to Congress when the appropriation came before the Senate was as follows:

"The problem of the location of a permanent building for the offices of the President involves many considerations as to the amount of accommodation needed and the scope and variety of the functions to be carried on in such a building. Provision for temporary quarters for the Executive offices is comparatively a simple matter. A building of brick, one story high, and containing from 50 to 75 per cent more room than the offices now occupy, can be constructed in the grounds of the White House opposite the entrance to the Navy Department. The building would take the place now occupied by a brick wall which screens a number of hothouses and forcing beds for plants, functions which may well be provided for elsewhere, in connection with the propagating gardens.

"The temporary building would include:

"1. A Cabinet room.

"2. President's office and retiring room.

"3. Offices for two secretaries.

"4. A telegraph and telephone room.

"5. A large room for the stenographers.

"6. A room for the press.

"7. A main hall to be fitted as a reception room.

"8. File rooms and closets in the basement."

Congress stipulated that the walls should be sufficient to carry a second story, and increased the appropriation by $10,000 for this purpose. Accordingly the walls were strengthened to meet this requirement. It is to be hoped, however, that no increase in height will be permitted, because of the injury that would result to the White House.

Of the total amount available, $6,000 was assigned to the superintendent of public buildings and grounds for inspection and for the removal of the greenhouses. The cost of the building alone was $45,126.75, and $14,054.77 was expended on furniture, carpets, rugs, electric lighting, and other fixtures. The work began on the approval of the sundry civil act, June 20, 1902, and the building was completed on the 29th day of the following September, although it was not occupied until about the middle of October, the postponement being made for the purpose of securing perfect drying.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senate ready for the question on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] to the amendment of the committee?

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire is in the right direction, but it does not cover all that should be covered before this subject passes from the attention of the Senate. From the observation of Senators in the past and the debate here it is disclosed that Congress is now confronted not simply with the question of the erection of a single building in one place, but of some marked and defined and large plan under which costly buildings for the use of the Government will hereafter be erected in Washington. For one I do not and shall not consent that anything be done until the whole subject is investigated, until it is seen at what reasonable expense desirable property to a large extent can be purchased, and I shall insist that nothing further be done until an examination is made and a report is submitted to Congress upon some large plan which will involve the erection upon Government property of the numerous public buildings which will be required in the course of the next twenty years.

And in considering that question the subject of the intrusion of the architect should also be considered, and no step should be taken and no contract should be made with any architect until reports are made to Congress at the next session of Congress covering that as well as the question of the location of public buildings. So I repeat the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire is in the right direction, but does not sufficiently provide for and guard the future.

Now, as to the points which the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] has raised here with reference to the connection of the architect with the White House establishment and the office near by, nothing that I said the other day or that the Senator from Iowa said the other day—and I know I speak for him as well as for myself—will be withdrawn. The committee had to stand jealously over every step that was taken with reference to the work on the White House to see that the architect did not practically destroy the whole effect, the fine effect, the beautiful effect of that building. The architect was opposed to the erection of any building for an office for the President, for the reason that at that time the scheme which the Senator from Indiana now fathers, and which provides for a public building on the farther side of the square—I say provides for its building there because everybody understands it will go there if this bill passes——

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senater from Maine yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I do not know the basis of the Senator's belief that it will go there if this bill passes. The Senator understands very well that the Commission is given authority by the bill to consider a number of sites, this being one of the number. I certainly would strongly favor its going there.

Mr. HALE. Undoubtedly.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. But whether the Commission would favor its location there, I do not know.

Mr. HALE. The Senator is very frank about it, and that tells

the whole story. But the original scheme was that this immense building—the largest in range upon the ground of any in Washington and the most expensive, not containing the most room and the most facilities for public business, but the largest in range spread upon the ground—should contain not only the two Departments provided for there, but the Presidential offices. The scheme was grand. It was to give an entire floor of this immense building to the President's offices and to put him into a building where two other Departments of the Government were engaged in doing their work, so that he would be at all times open to the visit of everybody who went to the building in connection with other Departments. That was the scheme of the architect, and the architect stood resolutely against everything which interfered with it.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. NEWLANDS. May I ask the Senator from Maine whether he intends to say it is a scheme of Mr. McKim to put the President's offices over in that building?

Mr. HALE. Undoubtedly.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Is not the Senator from Maine aware that the architect of that building is a Mr. Post, of New York, and not Mr. McKim?

Mr. HALE. It is a question of one architect or another, and all the architects who go to make up the general association of architects—I do not know what it is called—work together. But that was the scheme.

Mr. NEWLANDS. If the Senator will permit another interruption, let me say that in conversation with Mr. McKim upon this subject he said that it was the idea of the President in the first instance to have the Executive offices away from the old White House.

Mr. HALE. It was.

Mr. NEWLANDS. But that subsequently he changed his mind.

Mr. HALE. The President abandoned it——

Mr. NEWLANDS. Absolutely abandoned it.

Mr. HALE. Not at the incitation of Mr. McKim. Of course I do not know who spoke to the President. I know what did occur.

Mr. NEWLANDS. May I ask the Senator from Maine whether he thinks Mr. McKim was engaged in an effort to persuade the President to move the Executive offices over to that corner and to locate them in the building which was designed by Mr. Post? Does not the Senator think it much more reasonable that Mr. McKim was simply pursuing the directions the President had in his own mind regarding the location of the Executive offices?

Mr. HALE. I do not know upon that point and I do not care. I am going to recite what the committee had to do in order to protect the situation.

The joint committee of the two Houses, acting together, visited the White House and went over the ground, and protested to the President that the architect should not be allowed in any way to interfere with the simplicity and the grandeur of the White House; not a great, immense, massive structure, but simple and grand in its smaller details.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator from Maine permit me to ask him a question in this connection?

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. BACON. I desire to ask the Senator whether or not, prior to the time when the committee made that visit, there had been any action on the part of Congress authorizing the reconstruction of the White House?

Mr. HALE. It was all comprehended in the provision which I propose to read from the appropriation act. The joint committee upon it was the committee that visited the President. It was all done on the appropriation bill.

Mr. BACON. I understand that, but I want to know whether that provision in the appropriation bill was subsequent to the visit that the Senator speaks of?

Mr. HALE. My impression is that the final phrasing of the provision and putting it into form by the committee may have been subsequent to the visit, or there may have been more than one visit. But it was the result of what the committee considered the danger we were under that there would be bold and unwise innovations in that building.

Mr. BACON. The particular inquiry that I desire to address to the Senator is whether it is not true that this work was undertaken and designed prior to any action by Congress authorizing the reconstruction of the building?

Mr. HALE. I do not know——

Mr. BACON. Is it not true that the visit was due to the fact that information came to members of the committee that this work was about to be undertaken?

Mr. HALE. Oh!

Mr. BACON. And that subsequent to that time provision was made in the appropriation bill for carrying it out?

Mr. HALE. If the Senator means that the scheme for entirely going over the White House and making changes there was in the minds of other persons before it came to the Committee on Appropriations, that is true, undoubtedly.

Mr. BACON. Is it not true that the architect was engaged and on his work before there was any authorization by Congress?

Mr. HALE. I have no doubt whatever of that.

Mr. NEWLANDS. If the Senator will permit an interruption, I will state that the entire design by this architect was before the Appropriations Committee when this appropriation was made. I have in my hand the original design of this office, which is marked "Temporary Executive Offices," and the estimates upon which your committee acted show that they simply contemplated a restoration of the White House, and not a new and original structure.

Mr. HALE. I want to comment, by and by, upon the impudence of the architect who, in the face of the act of Congress, persisted in declaring that this office should be only a temporary office. Congress did not provide that and did not intend that. It did not intend that great space should be given in another building far away, but that suitable and commodious quarters for a permanent establishment of the Executive offices should be made; and to prove that, this is the language which, after these conferences with the President, the committee finally put into the bill:

For a building to accommodate the offices of the President, to be located in the grounds of the Executive Mansion, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, including heating apparatus and light fixtures, furniture, and removal of greenhouses, all to be done according to plans the details of which shall be approved by the President—

That was put in because the committee had adjured the President, and he had declared to us in terms and in his characteristic manner that if he had to sit up nights he would see to it that the rude hand of no architect was laid upon that building. So we put in the provision—

the details of which shall be approved by the President and completed in every respect within the sum hereby appropriated, $65,196—

Now, why so large? Because the design of the committee—the design adopted by Congress—was not what the architect impudently thrusts upon us as a transient, temporary building, but a permanent building, one story of which was to be built at the time and the other afterwards. Now, let me go on—

to be expended by contract or otherwise, in the discretion of and under the direction of the President—

Again we were very careful to limit that—

and to be immediately available, and said building—

That is, the office—

shall be constructed with sufficient foundation and walls suitable for a durable, permanent building, and of sufficient strength for an additional story when needed.

I know something about this, because I had something to do with drawing that provision, and I knew if we did not do that and did not put it in the act, the architect, who was determined that there should be no permanent office there, would put up such a building that he could declare thereafter that it could not be increased and that another story could not be added to it. That is why we followed this thing up and were compelled to follow it up; and to-day there are thrust before us a programme and sketches and drawings for a temporary office. I do not like to see Congress dealt with in that way.

Whether it be an architect, or a contractor, or whoever it may be, it is the business of anybody executing the law of Congress to conform to it and carry it out, and not to continue to harbor and lurk privily with his own designs in order to ineffectuate everything that Congress does.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I assume the Senator will admit that if the Committee on Appropriations contemplated a durable and permanent building of a monumental character, it was necessary for them to make a sufficient appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. HALE. Who has said anything about a building of a monumental character?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Very well.

Mr. HALE. The Senator is talking the jargon of the architect. I have not said anything about a building of a monumental character. It needs to be a plain, distinct, modest building of two stories, which will not in any way interfere with the President, with none of the roseate colors that the Senator has pictured, and without minarets and domes and all that. That the committee had nothing whatever to do with. It ought to be a plain, modest structure; and instead of its being confined and the President being put down on the ground, right on the floor, he should be put up on the upper floor, and the lower floor should be used for clerks and offices. It should be a place where, when we visit the President, we will not have to be put in holes and corners, as all of us are. But the architect does not want that. He never did want that.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Will the Senator permit another interruption?

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Let me call the attention of the Senator to the fact that while the committee provided that the building should be a structure "with sufficient foundation and walls suitable for a durable, permanent building, and of sufficient strength for an additional story when needed," they certainly did not at that time contemplate a completed building.

Let me add that the architect has provided durable walls; that they are permanent, and that they are of sufficient strength for an additional story when needed. All that the architect says is that it will be an architectural defect if the additional story is added.

As to my remark regarding the monumental character of the building, that was provoked by the general criticism of the design, the assumption that the offices were inferior in appearance, not partaking of the general character of the public buildings of this city, and my answer to that is that it could have been secured if the committee of which the Senator is a member had provided a sufficient appropriation. The appropriation asked for was only $33,000 for a temporary building, and the Appropriation Committee added $10,000 to that, and it was simply contemplated to make a strong foundation and durable and strong walls, all of which was done by Mr. McKim. So there is no criticism to be indulged in against the architect for his alleged failure to comply with the directions of the committee or of the law. They have been complied with to the letter. The point is that the architects designed simply temporary offices and asked an appropriation of $33,000. The committee added $10,000 for the purpose of making strong foundations and walls. This has been done. The building is durable enough, but owing to the small appropriation is not of the same standard in material and decoration as other public buildings, and hence it must be regarded as a temporary device to meet an emergency.

Mr. HALE. Only as I have said; it was intended to be a permanent structure. We thought we would put on one story and see how it would work. Everybody has seen that it does not work. There is not room enough there. But a moderate story, plain, can be superimposed upon the present building, with no decorations, no spires, no false coloring, which will give ample accommodations for the President and all his offices for forty years to come. That was the design of the committee—to try one story. If we had not put on the provision I have read, the architect would have built a building on which he would have told us it was impossible to superimpose another story.

I wish to say a few words on the general claim that the Senator makes and the architects' association makes for large fees for all public buildings. I make no war upon architects. Where we maintain a very large Supervising Architect's force, whose only purpose and whose only work is to make plans and prepare for public buildings by sketches and plans, and to control it and manage it and see that it is done according to law, I do not think an architect should come in and charge what he charges a private individual or a railroad company or an association or an insurance company that builds a building and has no such force as we have.

By the way, I had an experience illustrating this. The Supervising Architect's Office is under the control of a very competent gentleman. Of course he is an architect, and when the architects lay down to him fees he will not report against his fellow-associates. But he has a very large office, and this year he wanted more, and at his request, in company with the Assistant Secretary, when I had charge of the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, I visited the Treasury Department to see what was needed. We gave him additional room and additional force to do this very work of preparing plans and supervising the construction of Government buildings.

I find here, on page 17 of the legislative act just passed, a provision for the Supervising Architect, with his assistants, messengers, etc., and it provides for a general force, including draftsmen, engineers, computers, accountants, copyists, and all that:

And the services of skilled draftsmen, civil engineers, computers, accountants, assistants to the photographer, copyists, and such other services as the Secretary of the Treasury may deem necessary and specially order, may be employed in the Office of the Supervising Architect exclusively to carry into effect the various appropriations for public buildings, to be paid for from and equitably charged against such appropriations: *Provided*, That the expenditures on this account for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, shall not exceed $350,000.

We are keeping up, and have kept up, and will keep up, a force in the Supervising Architect's Office to do all this work, which force until a few years ago, until the Tarsney Act—and nobody knew how far it would go, nobody knew when it was passed what would be claimed for the act—did all this and did it well. There was no objection found with the erection of buildings throughout the United States under the Supervising Architect, but at that time, without much heat, without scrutiny enough, Congress passed the so-called "Tarsney Act," which was never intended to substitute and to make additional to all this force an outside architect for every public building. It was only supposed that it would apply in a minor degree in certain cases. Now, no building anywhere can be erected by the Government, paid for by the Government, plans made by the Government—if this great force is doing anything in the Supervising Architect's Office—unless there is some professional architect who gets his big fees.

I quoted the other day from the report of the House committee——

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President——

Mr. HALE. The Senator from Nevada will excuse me. I quoted the other day from the report of the House committee on the urgent deficiency bill, showing where $500,000, or about that, was given by Congress for an extension to the insane asylum across the river. It was not difficult work. The Supervising Architect's Office could have done the whole of it easily. But a firm of architects was employed. They charged $9,000 for the plans. Then they charged their percentage on the whole contract, and then a percentage on every payment on the contract, and they drew out of the Treasury $47,000 as their fee. Now, you can not make me believe, and the Senator who is enamored of architects and sees nobody else, who is enamored of all the schemes and plans of the architects, can not make me believe that that was necessary.

Before this bill passes from the supervision of the Senate there will be amendments offered which will restrict and constrain not

only the architects, but everybody else. We ought not now, meeting, as we do, the opportunity for acquiring at a reasonable expense a great tract of land on the south side of the Avenue and changing it from a rookery of old buildings to the site of magnificent public buildings, to let it pass unavailed of. We ought not to provide for dumping down a public building anywhere else until we get a report from some suitable commission telling us what that triangle will cost: and then, when that is done, at the next session of Congress—I hope I have not gone into this thing superficially—what the Senate ought to do is to provide a special committee to take this matter in charge.

These things do not come especially under any one committee. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds deals with the general question of public buildings and grounds throughout the country. Not a single building that I know of has been built in Washington in the last ten years under the control of that committee. Neither does the District Committee seek to do that.

There ought to be a committee made up of such Senators as the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, for the District is interested in this matter; the Senator from Indiana [Mr. FAIRBANKS], who is chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and who is a conservative, careful man; the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON]; the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN], who has had long service here, and other Senators. They ought to take this whole matter in charge and report to Congress a plan upon which we can begin to construct buildings on the lower side of the Avenue; and then the question of the architects' fees will come up also. But we ought not to be hurried along and driven to pass a bill of this kind, putting up an immense structure on the western side of that park, when we ought to put everything that is built hereafter for the next thirty years on the land below the Avenue.

5951

O

Boston Public Library
Central Library, Copley Square

Division of
Reference and Research Services

The Date Due Card in the pocket indicates the date on or before which this book should be returned to the Library.

Please do not remove cards from this pocket.